UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

All of the People

By ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Amnesty

By CHARLES F. DOLE

The Spiritual Ideal of Unity

By VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH

VOLUME LXXXIX NUMBER 22

Chicago, August 17, 1922

PUBLISHED BI-WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES *: Editors :* FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
HENRY R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
E. D. Morel
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name .....

Address .....

- -

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss) _____

Address _____

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 339
All of the People.—REV. ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY 341
Amnesty.—REV. CHARLES F. DOLE 343
Across the Pacific.—Editorial Correspondence.—REV. SYDNEY STRONG 343

ARTICLES—
The Joy of Life. IV.—EDWARD ARTHUR ROCKWOOD 344
The Spiritual Ideal of Unity.—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH 345
Earning and Grabbing.—LUCIA AMES MEAD.. 346
England's Relations with France.—*Robert Dell* 347
An Appeal.—*International Committee* 349

CORRESPONDENCE—
Progress.—HENRY OLDYS 350
Patriotism and Peace.—LYDIA G. WENTWORTH. 350

POETRY—
Heaven.—*O. Chester Brodhay* 339
Technic.—CHARLES WHARTON STORK 346
In a Pleasaunce.—KATHARINE HANSON AUSTIN 350

THE FIELD—
Russian Children 351
Philippine Independence.—WILLIAM C. ALLEN. 351
The Tragic Passing of the English Country Mansion.—*Manchester Guardian* 351

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

Vol. LXXXIX. THURSDAY, AUGUST 17, 1922 Number 22

HEAVEN

Today the people sang praises
For the good things that had come to them.
The sun's warm glow caressed the mountainside.
The valleys bathed in mist were dreaming
The dreams of awakening youth.
The atmosphere diffused the beauty of holiness.
The perfume of buds and leaves
And fragrant bark.
The odor of dewy earth
And the freshness of rollicking streams.
Nature rejoiced
In the richness of its possessions,
In the light of constant birth,
In the resurrection of slumbering ideas,
In the awakening of good,
In the realization of Heaven—
Not as a location—
But as Harmony.

—*O. Chester Brodhay.*
From "By the Wayside" (The Libby Company, Chicago).

One of the most discouraging phases of the present strike situation in the United States is the apparent utter lack of fundamental economic reconstruction. The little vision of industrial democracy that was gained during the war seems to have been largely lost during these days of general lethargy and reaction. As far as the phenomena of the strikes are concerned, they might have taken place ten years ago—so little advance has been made in recognizing the need for a new relationship between capital and labor. Perhaps the one hopeful note is sounded by the miners in their demand for a fact finding agency which would at least provide a basis of realism for the settlement of the periodic disputes which wrack the vitals of that industry. If we could have adequate facts presented from an impartial point of view, we could at least dispel some of the haze and prejudice which now surround the subject of mining in most persons' minds. But even this demand for facts, as important as it may be, is not enough. We must not forget that the fundamental need is for a thorough-going reconstruction of all the basic industries in terms of a democracy which would restore the confidence of all concerned in a system which today is distrusted because antiquated.

There is no absurdity too great for the popular interest in spiritualism to reach. We are not speaking of the serious and scientific interest in the problem of human immortality, but of that purely ephemeral "name" of faddism which at present is sweeping over the country. For the latest illustration we are indebted to the Boston *Globe* which recounts the fact that a boarding house mistress, in order to attract patrons to her establishment, advertised a live ghost on the premises. In order to fulfill expectations and provide sufficient thrills, a man was hired for the purpose. The result was that the boarding house was thronged with applicants and the woman did a thriving business until a photographer took a picture of the apparition and found it to be of "too, too, solid flesh"! Of how many hoaxes is the gullable public capable? And no matter how many times it is fooled, it rushes to the next one with equal avidity. Surely Barnum was right.

We welcome our "esteemed contemporary," the *Country Gentlemen,* into the ranks of the growing number of magazines which are taking up the cause of the Community Church. This oldest agricultural journal in the country is performing a valuable service in devoting much of its space from time to time to telling the story of successful church mergers and community enterprises. The editors do not have the same conception of the Community Church as that held by Unity; but their services are unquestionably of great value in bringing the attention of small country towns to the wicked waste and inefficiency of the competing sectarian bodies now in control. Once this preliminary step is taken, the more progressive conceptions will naturally follow.

We have heard much of the "White Terror" in Hungary and of the autocratic military machine which rules there with such unyielding repression. The best recent confirmation of this came to us on the day of the great peace demonstrations which were held in most of the countries of Europe as well as in the United States. But the government of Hungary would not permit the pacifists of that land to parade or to make any public demonstrations whatsoever against war. With such an attitude on the part of the official government the long suffering people are indeed in a hopeless plight; and it will be hard for the most heroic peace-lover to prevent his country from drifting into war. This is a clear illustration of the fact that one of the chief problems in establishing peace in the world is the problem of establishing democracy in the world so that

the plain people may express their hatred of war and their desire to live harmoniously with their neighbors.

Mr. Austen Harrison, Editor of the *English Review*, in a remarkable and illuminating article in the July number of *Foreign Affairs* on the "Cause of the War and the National Duty Today," says:

> To saddle Germany with the sole responsibility is from what we already know—and more will come—an absurdity; to frame a treaty on an absurdity is an injustice. Humanly, morally, and historically, the Treaty of Versailles stands condemned, quite apart from its economic monstrosities. It stands condemned because the war was won by the world and as such the peace is a world responsibility, and particularly if our cause was just. The present peace merely reflects France's attitude of fear and hate toward Germany, and had it not been for the fantastic weakness of England and America at the Peace Conference, peace would have been imposed in conformity with the armistice terms as laid down by President Wilson and accepted by us and Germany. That is the world's problem today, how to civilize its own peace. For if the world cannot attain to even relative justice, what hope is there that individual nations can?

The Treaty has to be revised in accordance with modern ideas. In the main we agree with Mr. Harrison but we think he errs in placing too much responsibility on France for the Treaty. When the war ended the world was almost if not quite insane with rage and hate. Lloyd George carried an election on two planks in his platform. One was, "hang the Kaiser," and the other was, "Germany must pay all the costs of the war." The Treaty reflects not only the attitude of France but also of her allies and associates in the war. The people who were willing to let German babies starve to punish the sins of the Kaiser were in no mood to enact the "Fourteen Points" into a treaty.

Mr. A. G. Gardiner, long editor of the London *Daily News* and recognized as one of the best informed men in England, says in a recent article in the New York *World*:

> The situation in Europe is passing beyond control. It might be redeemed if goodwill and sanity prevailed, but, with Poincaré at the helm, France leads Europe in a mad dance of death.

UNITY has been criticized by some of its readers during the past two years because it has continuously sought to arouse public opinion to the point of recognizing the madness of the rulers of the dominant states in Europe. But no word that UNITY has uttered during these years has been more direct or searching than this word of Mr. Gardiner. He speaks not because he hates France but because he sees to what point the policy of fear and hate is leading the peoples of Europe. But it must be remembered that the policy of France rests upon the Treaty of Versailles. The responsibility for that treaty rests upon no one nation. As long as it remains there is no hope for Europe.

And now Harvard has joined those who are hitting the man who is slowly and laboriously climbing up the precipice of prejudice and hate. He is by no means near the top. He is making his upward way against heavy odds and yet men unite in knocking him down again. It is great sport for humans, for he is only a Negro. Great Harvard, Fair Harvard, the Alma Mater of Wendell Phillips, hits him a hard blow by excluding him from the Freshman dormitories. A man's room may truly be his castle. But that does not involve his control over the room of another man. If a university is a public institution; if the funds of Harvard are held in trust, by the permission of the state, the exclusion of a colored man from the Harvard dormitories is a violation of a public trust. Some men say they do not like the Negro so they kick him off the street. Harvard follows that example to its eternal shame. If there is any argument for a State University in Massachusetts it is in Harvard's treatment of the Negro.

Henry Ford's crusade against the Jew has not utterly failed. We hoped it would. But such a virulent and persistent torrent of vilification and misrepresentation we felt sure would do immeasurable injury to mankind. But the first practical evidence of the evil that has been done is now at hand. The prejudices of the average man, or all men who are not Jews, may have been deepened and strengthened, but as far as we know no group of the unlearned has organized any pogroms, in America at least, against that race, the treatment of which for more than a thousand years has been an indictment of Christianity. We know of no group of workingmen who have refused to work with their Jewish brothers. No trade unions have excluded them from membership. But it has been left to certain of the Universities and Colleges of the land to make the first public response to Henry Ford's cruel and for the most part utterly false indictment of the Jew. It is the proud privilege of these centers of light to follow the example of Russia of the old regime and limit the attendance of Jews at these seats of learning. What a splendid thing it would have been for humanity if these same Universities had replied to Mr. Ford's appeal to passion and prejudice by openly inviting to their classes all of every race and creed who desire the opportunities they afford? But alas, they arrayed themselves, as Universities have done so often in the past, on the side of passion and prejudice.

The International Congress of Free Christians and other Religious Liberals, initiated by the American Unitarians twenty-two years ago, and which has held eight successful and influential world conferences in Boston, London, Amsterdam, Geneva, Berlin and Paris, attended by the representatives of 30 nations and over a hundred religious fellowships, is to hold a session in Leiden, Holland, during this month of August (27th to 29th). It will be simply a gathering of forty

or fifty friends representing Great Britian, the United States, Germany, Holland, Scandinavia, Italy, Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary, Palestine, India and half a dozen other peoples to discuss the future of the Congress and, if possible, arrange for a larger meeting next year. The Unitarian Laymen's League voted an appropriatoin of $10,000 to sustain the work of this Congress in the intermission between its present and a future resumption of full activities. This has enabled the new secretary, Rev. Wm. H. Drummond of London, to devote much of his attention, and to travel extensively in Europe and the Nearer East, in its behalf.

The present writer, now honorary secretary, had arranged to take a large company of American delegates to the forthcoming meetings. It was decided, however, that a Congress on the usual large scale could not be undertaken this year in Europe, and the plan was given up. It is hoped that next year, if a Congress should be held, the excursion from America will be revived, and assure a large attendance from this country at the meetings. The opportunity and demand for such an organization of religious liberals throughout the world was never greater than now.

We reprint the article from *Foreign Affairs* (London) on the Relations between Great Britian and France because it is from the pen of a true friend of France—Mr. Robert Dell was the Paris correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian.* He is the author of "My Second Country—France." His knowledge of modern France and French politics is probably unrivalled. It is of the greatest importance, now that the whole edifice of the Treaty of Versailles is toppling, that the people of the United States should realize the real state of affairs affecting Great Britian and France, as it is seen by an European of large experience. Many of us have been living in a fools' paradise since the treaty was signed and it is now time to leave that unprofitable habitation and enter into the realm of reality. Whether we like it or not, the time is fast approaching when the treaty itself and its preposterous machinery, including the abortive League of Nations, will have to be scrapped, and some other expedient found for restoring financial and commercial sanity in Europe. Mr. Dell's article will undoubtedly enlighten many of those people who, even at this late day, are genuinely anxious to know the truth.

All of the People

The problem of modern life is not primarily one of either food or shelter. It is true that in some parts of the world these primordial facts of life have to be considered. Famine and cold are scourges of undeveloped peoples remote from the centers of civilization now—as they were of our fathers. But when either of these monsters comes within the breastworks of civilization we know that he can be slain. They have no magic power. They are not angels of vengeance sent by a wrathful Jehovah. We know they are not messengers of hate but conditions of life produced by our own selfishness and stupidity.

The Russian famine is not an act of God but an act of men. It belongs not in the realm of magic but of definite cause and effect. Most enlightened folk do not believe that famine is the good Lord's way of controlling the population of India. They have a notion that if some of the brains and energy that have been used in the past hundred years in building fortifications, strategic railways and in the exploitation of the people of that country, had been used in developing irrigation, famines would be banished as effectively as has yellow fever been from Cuba. We do not admit that periodic famines in China are inevitable. Control of rivers to prevent devastating floods and the development of transportation facilities are within the province of man. These would go a long way in stabilizing the food supply.

Typhus fever is no longer the scourge of God. It follows in the wake of armies organized and led by men. It is human product. There is nothing mysterious about it. We know it is a hideous result of "man's inhumanity to man."

So it is with a countless number of other "scourges" of the race. We know that they are not heaven-sent but born of our ignorance and greed. They are continued because of our apathy and indifference. The problems of the race belong to the race and are to be solved by men and women. At least there is no one else to solve them.

No one doubts this in matters which pertain to man's harnessing the powers of nature to do his will. In this field the word impossible has no place—for no one knows what is impossible. Every advance makes new problems. Every one of these is a challenge to the intelligence of men. Because it has not been done is no reason why it can not be done. Because men desire it to be done, providing it does not deny the very integrity of the universe in which they live, is very good reason to believe that it will be done. In chemistry and physics there are no traces of race or color. Steam and electricity yield their secrets to brain and not to color or race. These problems are human and the evidence of it lies in the fact that the magician has gone and the scientist has taken his place.

But when we come to consider the problems of human relations, of how people shall live and work together we find that it is difficult for many to understand that these are human problems. The idea that they are divine or belong to the order of the supernatural; that

they are to be solved by some occult or mysterious power unknown to man hardly needs even to be denied today. It has gone into the scrap heap of history.

And yet only slowly do men come to recognize that social problems are like all other problems. They hesitate to admit that people, just plain simple people, are the ones who must in the end solve every question that arises in the field of man's relation to man. It is admitted that men and women in every field of activity must do the work that is set before them. If it is not done by them it can never be done. But when we come to the questions which vitally concern men and women, which have not only to do with themselves, but also with their children and their children's children, then we find a very definite denial of the idea that these are to be solved by the people. These belong, it is claimed, to a part of the people. A few have become gods for the many. The man-directing god has gone and we have in his place those gifted by supernatural power to solve the basic problems of the race.

And the people who call themselves the most enlightened and intelligent in the world hold to this curious view. They qualify themselves as gods. In matters which pertain to science and mechanics they do not deny that even the most undeveloped savage must discover for himself, or utilize the experience of others, the mechanical principle of the lever. He must learn out of his own life, or that of others, the value of cleanliness. The hard road of experience must be traveled, it is said, in order that men may value what they gain out of the experience of life.

But along with this goes the astounding discovery that there are by nature master races and subject races; that some were born to rule and others born to serve. No master race was ever excessively modest in the recital of its own merits. Statesmen of these master races have easily allowed themselves to argue that the code of morals which exists among the rulers does not apply to the ruled. "The constitution does not follow the flag." This is the justification of all Imperialism. The English are in India because they have the high command from heaven. The evidence of that command is their natural superiority to the natives of India. This they display to the world and offer as the proof of their "divine mission."

We are in the Philippines because we, ourselves, of course, being the judges, are able to do good to the people of those Islands. How strange it is that these most enlightened people in the world should come to the conclusion that they have this heaven sent command.

Kings, emperors, kaisers and czars depart and yet the idea that they have represented dies hard. The feudal baron disappears and the industrial baron takes his place. The barons of the olden time won by the strength of their arms the place they occupied in society. They served a purpose and had value in the social order of their day. But the time came when the title represented nothing but a tradition. The inheritor instead of being an asset to society became a burden. But strange to relate he thought of himself as a divinely gifted man, one who belonged to the class that has the god-given responsibility of ruling the world.

The industrial baron has passed through the same evolutionary process. He claims as his divine right the power to determine the conditions of life for others. He knows. They do not. He, with others of his group, cannot understand why they should not be "masters" of things and of men.

The strangest form this idea of supernatural power has taken is that which is identified with color. A certain group of men in the world boldly say, "We are sent here to rule the world." Ask them for their credentials and they most immodestly reply, "Look at us. Can't you see for yourselves that we are white." There you have it. What reply can you make to the man who affirms, "This is a white man's country and by the Living God we intend to rule." No king ever offered more indisputable evidence of his divine right than this. The man is white. The country is his. Therefore it is, as God ordained, a white man's country.

So in all sorts of forms the thing we thought was gone does survive. Famine once was sent by God. Now we know it is not. We have the famine nevertheless. Men—some men—do not like the conditions of their employment, which is, after all, their life, they protest in the only way they know. They quit work. Then other men who are the masters of the conditions of their lives say, "You will come back. We will starve you to it." And famine not God-sent but man-sent does the work.

This is the fundamental contradiction in modern society. We affirm in one breath that the problems of society are to be solved by men. In the next we say that the chosen few, who possess the proper credentials of race, color or property, are the ones to whom the business of solving the problems of mankind is intrusted. It is this contradiction that divides men into two classes; those who believe that all men together must solve the problems of mankind and those who believe that this must be done by the few for the many. The choice is essentially between autocracy and democracy.

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY.

Amnesty

President Harding by his refusal of General Amnesty for the remaining political prisoners again disappointed the hopes of hundreds of thousands of American citizens. The able and widely representative committee who waited upon him, bearing the big petition, reported that he received them kindly. What did they expect otherwise? Though with gloved hand, he asserted his will. It was a characteristic act of a mean administration. The President can welcome a Newberry to the Senate; he can continue to bully the Haitian people; he can hold the fate of the Republic of Mexico in suspense; he can recognize the tyrannous and cruel Siberian government and hold Russia at arm's length; he can take a cheerful hand in levying foolish and burdensome military and tariff and shipping subsidy tolls on the Nation; he can be patient in the case of the big war grafts on the Treasury, such as *The Searchlight* has been demanding to have investigated. But wherever does he appear to know the meaning of magnanimity?

We have no unkind feeling toward Mr. Harding as a man. If we lived on his street in Marion, Ohio, we should doubtless value him as a good neighbor. Neither should we wonder, if four out of five men in any Chamber of Commerce or Labor Union or Church plumped into the President's position, and taking advice of their lawyers, would act as he has acted. But in the case of a President of the United States, or even a Senator, we look for something nobler than average human conduct. We rightly expect a heightening of character to accompany the splendid responsibility. It hurts us, therefore, to see our government fail in the grand test of magnanimous conduct.

Without the wide view and large human sympathies, there can be no adequate statesmanship. This is the trouble with our Government today. It is not merely that a few prisoners suffer; the whole world suffers. The situation is pathetic.

Let us imagine a letter such as the friends of UNITY might write to the President, if we had known him in Marion:

Dear Mr. Harding:

We are sorry that you have not released those political prisoners. All sorts of horrible things have been done (often in the name of legality) in the war time and since. It has been like a disease, and the more we know about it the less we dare to blame anyone. Good people have been caught with it.

Do you think, Mr. President, that this handful of prisoners, or any of them, have done or said specially worse things than thousands of us who are at large? We think, even if some of them are worse than you and we are, that they have been in jail long enough. Some of us believe that most of them have suffered great injustice. This case is like a sore in the body. So long as any of them remain in prison, there is going to be infection, poison and pain, and in proportion to the size of the sore.

Suppose a dozen of them seem to you to deserve further punishment. What of it? Will you make them better men by keeping them in jail? Will any one in the land become a better citizen for being told of your austerity? Will you take the risk of keeping the innocent among them in jail for the sake of punishing a few wretched men right up to the level of their deserts? Do you know, sir, the measure of any man's deserts?

Dear Mr. Harding, you profess to follow the teachings of the New Testament. Do you recollect that remarkable story about Jesus, when they brought him a "wicked" woman? They had a severe law that such women (not the men) could be stoned to death. Perhaps most of us would have liked to have her punished. People say, "We must enforce the law." But Jesus wanted to know who in that crowd was so much better than the woman as to begin to punish her. There was not one who dared, and Jesus forgave her. Do you think Jesus' treatment made her a worse woman? Did killing adulteresses ever stop sin? Did you ever try any experiment, Mr. Harding, with the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins? If not—do you call yourself a Christian? Please try to forgive us, if our letter offends you. We are your friends and neighbors.

CHARLES F. DOLE.

Across the Pacific

Editorial Correspondence

Mr. Sastri, of India, is now in Melbourne. It is pretty well understood, by officials, that he will get what he has come for, namely, removal of all discrimination against Indians, who are living in Australia. He is not asking that the doors of Australia should be opened to Indians, but that to those who are here there should be accorded the privileges that are accorded to other British nationals. He is favorable to India remaining in the Empire, otherwise, of course, he would not be permitted to speak.

For example, it was suggested that Tagore be invited to come to the University of Melbourne, for lectures, but it was promptly vetoed by the authorities of the University. Mrs. Besant is also in Australia trying to straighten out some of the recalcitrant Theosophists, but mainly to get it into the heads of the people, that India should be kept within the Empire. The British are now playing for big stakes; no less than the Empire.

Mr. Sastri is making a good impression, for he is an able, generous-hearted English-speaking gentleman, who knows how to get what he goes after. He is apt to leave the Occidentals wondering if the Occident has anything to teach the Orient. He is not here to break down the "White Australia" policy, but he is determined that every Indian shall be treated "white" when he is in Australia.

The reason that Mr. Sastri talks and walks like a victor is because he knows that he has behind him a Solid India. The white man does not give up privileges until compelled to; and this is true in India. The white man has seen that he cannot dominate the Indians, when they are united; and now they are united, and the white man must yield. This is not the last time that the white man is going to yield. It is going on, until the brown and yellow and red, and I think, black peoples will control their own destinies. The quicker the white man comes to this conclusion, the better for all concerned.

I am surprised that Mr. Sastri and Mrs. Besant speak with severe disapproval of Mr. Gandhi. They regard him as unpractical and as striving to upset all the good derived from 30 years of statesmanship. Yet, without Mr. Gandhi's movement of non-violence and non-co-operation, Mrs. Besant would still be pleading in vain for Home Rule and Mr. Sastri would not be getting an ovation in Australia. Gandhi has united India: he has also divided the "enemy." He has used the very tactics that all conquerors have used, namely: dividing the enemy; but instead of using material force, he has used a mightier power, i. e., soul-force. He united the soul of India in a mighty protest against domination, insult and cruelty, and in doing it divided the white world; for today, half the white world, British and others, are with Gandhi, in his prison cell. Mr. Gandhi has given to the world, as Dr. Holmes, in his excellent sermon of several months back, says, an exhibition of soul-force on a vast national scale, which is a striking confirmation of the rule of non-resistance as a method of political and economic reform; so striking indeed that he has "opened up a new era of human history as definitely as Newton or Darwin did."

Will you let me say that I spoke yesterday afternoon (Sunday) in the Playhouse, Melbourne, to a large crowd, on "The Negro Problem in America." I refer to it, because of the interest that is growing here in the colored peoples of the world. The whites are beginning to realize that they must think differently about their colored neighbors; so they were interested in knowing how the Negroes are carrying on in America. Well, my Negro friends would not have been ashamed of what I said about them, in "White Australia." I find Booker T. Washington is one of the heroes here. The people are stirred somewhat over the possibility of the introduction of indentured labor in the Northern Territory. I doubt if it will be done; yet "eternal vigilance," etc.

For example, when I passed through Honolulu, I heard they were agitating for the plan of bringing in 30,000 Chinese workers for the Hawaiian Islands. Knowing what a failure indentured labor has proved to be in South Africa, the Fijis and Australia, I wrote several people about it, among them Dr. Albert W. Palmer, Pastor of the Central Union Church. I had a reply from him yesterday, in which he said, he doubted much if any such proposition would go through Congress and then closed with these words, which are worth noting as having general bearing:

> The most advanced and progressive thinkers in Hawaii feel that the problem is ultimately not to be solved by bringing in additional labor, but by growing our own labor and adapting conditions on the plantations or else reorganizing our whole plantation system in such a way as will command the interest and loyalty of our Hawaiian-born citizens.

Out of my observations, I have come to two or three conclusions: (1) All people of all races who are admitted to a country should be granted all the privileges of citizens. (2) No people should be brought in, to whom the franchise may not be given. (3) All people of all races who are admitted to any country and given the franchise will prove to be an asset, and will be loyal to the land of their adoption. (4) Interracial marriage will safely and wisely take care of itself by voluntary choices, if the races concerned maintain a decent respect for each other.

SYDNEY STRONG.

The Joy of Life

IV.

"Oh, nothing."

It was in 1891. Brand Whitlock, now well known to the American public because of his service as ambassador to Belgium, was connected with the Chicago *Herald*. The morning edition had gone to press, and Mr. Whitlock was dining with one of his newspaper friends in a small Chicago restaurant. The conversation turned to the Haymarket riot. The friend, Mr. R., asked Mr. Whitlock where he was at the time the tragedy occurred.

"In Toledo," answered Brand Whitlock.

"What did people think of it there?"

"Of the hanging?"

"Yes."

For a moment Mr. Whitlock watched the little coils of fire play among the particles of tobacco as Mr. R. lit a cigarette. "What did people in Toledo think of the hanging of the Chicago anarchists? What did any people, anywhere, think of it? What was customary, what was proper, appropriate and indispensable under such circumstances? In a word, what was there to do with anarchists except to hang them?" These were the questions which were racing through the future diplomat's mind as he answered, "Why, they thought it was right, of course. Why?"

"Oh, nothing," answered his friend.

A faint, elusive smile evinced itself in Mr. R.'s narrowed eyes as with these two words he brought the conversation regarding the trial and conviction of the seven professed teachers of anarchism to an abrupt close, but the effect which those words and that smile had on Mr. Whitlock has remained with him to this day. It was then that his mind first realized that long established conventional customs and standards are not infallible; that seemingly firmly rooted institutions are often founded upon very questionable ethical norms.

In such an attitude of mind as we have revealed to us in the character of Mr. Whitlock's friend, lies the hope of civilization. Not unquestionably to accept old principles because they are old, or modern standards and methods because they are modern, but rather in dispassionate reflection to carefully weigh the social values to be found in each—on such a mental foundation we can safely erect our world of tomorrow.

We are changing organisms living on a changing planet. Methods of conduct applicable to one generation do not, necessarily, fit the social needs of a later generation. Each age has its own specific problems, and its ethical standards must be determined in the light of those problems. Ultimate truth can only exist in a static universe. Our world is passing through an evolutionary process; consequently all of our truths are relative. If mankind is to survive in such a cosmos, he must constantly change his social norms. Today we champion democracy, but for how long can this institution serve us? When means for

transportation were meagre, and methods for rapid communication between nations non-existent, a strict nationalistic governmental policy best served our social interests, but for how long can we cling with safety to this crumbling political policy. No institution is immortal. The world is changing, and these must change with it. The man who looks upon no principle as being indisputably right, but who is constantly seeking for those social institutions which can best serve his generation—such a man is keeping abreast with the advance of civilization; albeit in conversation with the unawakened mind he will often be forced to answer, "Oh, nothing."

EDWARD ARTHUR ROCKWOOD.

The Spiritual Ideal of Unity

Never was there a time when the spiritual ideals called more loudly for faithful souls to make them known than to-day. Never was the world so clearly aware of its need of more substantial reliances than can be found in the shifting about of conflicting material interests. We are waking out of a horrible nightmare to find that what we had supposed was real was only a disordered and distressing dream. The house of life that man has been so painstakingly building turns out to be a house builded on the sand, a house that cannot stand. From its very foundations the world must be reconstructed. From its very foundations—mankind must begin to rebuild its house of life.

We do not need to mourn over the past. It will do no good to grow bitter and hard in a vain effort to shirk responsibility and to fasten the blame for the world's upheaval on others. The truth is we have all of us been at fault. The world is broken and torn asunder, and what we called "civilization" has come to naught only for one reason: that we have all of us gone our separate way in pursuit of our petty, private ambitions. We have tried to serve two masters—the Mammon of self-seeking and, only half-heartedly, the God of our highest conception.

Amid all this darkness and confusion of the world's wrecked life one unmistakable realization of truth is being driven into our consciousness—one lesson the whole world is learning. And it matters not what the cost. Once that lesson is really taken to heart there will be compensation in abundance for what we have endured, or must yet endure. Let us not be weak-hearted over the world's pitiful stupidity and wilful blindness to truth. There is not an experience that can come to us, individually or collectively, that will not in the final accounting prove beneficial. If we must go through hell to reach heaven we can turn every step of the way to good account.

This one lesson which the world must ultimately learn is that human life is to be transformed into spiritual life. Which means only this, again: that selfishness must be replaced by love. Or, to put it in another form of speech, individualism is of infinite value, *but only as a social asset.*

Ultimately the lesson of unity must be learned. It is in accordance with the order of the universe. It is life's lesson. There is no dodging the issue. Sooner or later—no telling how many foolish experiments we must needs make meantime—the world will learn that:

> Love is life's transcendent note
> And the perfect way to God!

Our immediate problem—yours and mine, dear comrades of the spirit—is to search our hearts until we have utterly uprooted the last vestige of the poisonous growth of self-seeking. Your problem and mine is to take home to ourselves unblinkingly the Christ teaching that we cannot serve self *and* God; that we cannot become spiritual if we are looking for a reward for becoming spiritual. Your problem and mine is to reconstruct from its very foundations the house of our own inner being.

> Vain are the struggles to retain self!
> Vain the tarrying through numberless births!

We did not come independently into life. We were not born of one mother merely but of countless mothers. We are not kin to a single family but to humanity. We do not belong to ourselves but to one another. There is no such thing as personal salvation; and, even were there, those who seek it most would be farthest from it. The greatest gospel ever preached by the most enlightened of all souls was not given to the world for personal salvation. And there can be no worse mockery of Christ than to attempt to gain a selfish advantage from his suffering and death.

Reduced to its simplest terms, cleansed and purified from all its theological and ecclesiastical admixtures, Christianity amounts to only this—a crusade against selfishness. And this means love—the practice of love and the recognition of Universal Love. And this, again, means unity—the oneness of all souls; the spiritual fellowship of the world.

So tremendously and gloriously great is the beauty-and-truth of the spiritual ideal of unity that I wonder how we can allow ourselves to think and labor and strive for the lesser things; or how we can be drawn into the petty disputes and squabbles of those to whom material advantages seem supreme.

Urgent beyond words is the call of beauty-and-truth that we make ourselves worthy to be its messengers. That our hearts become temples and shrines for its worship. That in our relation to one another and to all creatures we become in spirit and in character beauty-and-truth. This is the spiritual basis upon which peace must be established first of all in ourselves and then in our common life. There is no beauty-and-truth more beautiful and true than this spiritual ideal of unity—to bring all souls into divine relationship to one another.

Let us keep vividly in mind the highest and holiest ideals—keep them so vividly in mind that whatever lesser matters we have to deal with, our dealings will always be carried on in the light of those ideals. If it is unity we love and to which we would in all things be loyal, let us not forget it for a moment lest we be betrayed into words or acts of a discordant and disruptive nature. The gospel of peace cannot be violently proclaimed, nor can love be forcibly established.

The beauty and truth of unity—of the spiritual oneness of all souls—cannot fail to win the allegiance of mankind if we—a growing number of us—will make the complete self-surrender which unity requires. We

cannot contend for the selfish gain of material values and at the same time be faithful servants of beauty and truth—we cannot obey two masters.

For myself (if you will pardon my closing on the personal note) it has come to be a most profound and sacred resolution that I will not fight for any success that is not, beyond all doubt or question, a universal success. I will have no part in to-day's makeshifts and no share in anything that divides and alienates man from man in any way. I will not take sides in the warring strifes about me. I belong to the spiritual fellowship of the world—in that I find my creed, my party, my country, my religion and my God. For you, for myself and for all souls my prayer is that we may seek and find the fulfilment of life's divine possibilities in our love one of another—in our love of beauty and truth; and so shall we be kept in the love of God!

Mighty and wonderful love's power to bless!
More mighty than the sea—
More vast than time!
A living God in every loving heart;
A heaven of joy in every kindly deed;
Wisdom and power in every tender thought.
Life holds no truer gift, no deeper bliss!

VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH.

Earning and Grabbing

The modern world is developing a new sense regarding rights. It no longer stands in awe of the right of an emperor to rule. It will not much longer be fooled as to the so-called rights of coal barons and oil kings to God's gifts. What a man earns, what he receives from genuine production and service to the public, no sane man grudges. But it is rarely the inventor who becomes the multi-millionaire purely from his invention. It is almost as rarely the manufacturer who simply produces, without special privilege of tariff, conferred by the public, who becomes a multi-millionaire.

If a man honestly earned $1,000 a day for 365 days in the year, it would take him over 250 years to earn as much as the minimum sum estimated to have been left by one owner of standard oil stock who has just died. His total amount of "savings" over and above his luxurious living expenses may, indeed, have been over twice that amount—possibly $200,000,000. Did he ever delude himself into the belief that he had earned a moral right to this fabulous sum? Yet, having given away nothing that the public can remember during his life-time, he dies and leaves a suffering world, absolutely nothing. Nine-tenths of his accumulations belonged morally to his fellowmen who through antiquated laws had permitted him to grab what he could not earn.

I am not advocating socialism, or confiscation or limitation of the amount which any one may accumulate from his own production. But all people who can read the signs of the times and see what is at the basis of social unrest know two things. One is that God Almighty has put in the earth treasures which morally belong to the people of the state or nation and not to any one person who through privilege or accident manages to get hold of them first. And they know that if, for the time being, he can get and retain these treasures legally, he is hastening the economic revolution if he ignores his moral obligations in his will.

No superstition as regards witches, relics, devils or Dalai Lamas has been so dangerous as the superstition that legal "rights" are moral rights. Men are coming to see that no man has a moral right to the unknown treasure underground when he pays four dollars an acre for land which returns him coal or gold or oil a million times that amount. Selfish, short-sighted millionaires, who, unlike Mr. Carnegie, show no sense of public obligation are like the French grandees before the French Revolution or the Russian aristocracy before the Russian revolution. They are preparing bitter retribution for their children. The world is not going on many more decades under the old superstition as regards privilege and "rights" to God's gifts. Just as royal and imperial rights have been overthrown in Russia, Germany and Austria, so the so-called right to grab and hold mineral wealth, as distinguished from wealth resulting from man's labor, will be undermined by new legal restrictions as soon as the tendency to elect men like Col. Brookhart and Governor Frazier becomes dominant.

We may like it or not, but the movement to secure moral right will come to fruition violently, painfully, and with far greater loss to every one than we have yet seen in coal and railroad strikes, if it does not come legally and peacefully through men who can foresee the inevitable Armageddon if moral rights are much longer flouted. No one person is to blame for the existing economic order and for getting wealth under existing laws which encourage special privilege. He is to be blamed however when he is utterly lacking in the sense of *noblesse oblige* and coolly takes enormous revenues and ignores the millions who are illiterate, starving, and morally neglected whom his superfluous wealth might have saved.

It behooves the five percent who own as much as the other ninety-five percent to ease a situation which they did not create, but for whose continuance they are largely responsible. No one in these troublous days can afford to arouse hot resentment by the multitude. A quarter of a million dollar mausoleum for a man who has so conspicuously ignored his fellowmen becomes no object of honor, but is rather a red flag to the unprivileged. LUCIA AMES MEAD.

TECHNIC

I'm fond of weaving subtle webs
With soft, somniferous words,
Of linking labial melodies
Like rippling notes of birds;

But when God sends an urge of joy
To give my fellow-man,
I only try to pass it on
As simply as I can.

CHARLES WHARTON STORK.

England's Relations with France

Not since the Transvaal war has there been such bitter feeling in France against England. The humorous papers are perhaps the best indication of public opinion. They are filled with caricatures holding up England to ridicule, contempt, and hatred, or representing England and Germany united in enmity to France. Although its manifestations in the Press are more discreet and much less virulent, anti-French feeling is almost equally strong in England, and is daily growing stronger. In both countries the feeling has considerable justification so far as the respective Governments are concerned, but this condemnation of a whole nation on both sides of the Channel is as silly as it is odious and dangerous. Unfortunately, the English and French publics, taught as they have been for several years to regard hatred of a whole nation as a religious duty, are even less than normally capable of exercising a minimum of reason, and easily transfer their hatred from one nation to another.

The chief cause of anti-French feeling in England, as in Italy and many other countries, is no doubt the belief that France is the principal disturber of European peace and the chief obstacle to European unity. So far as official France—the French Government—is concerned, that belief is fully justified. Official France is indeed "le trouble-paix de l'Europe," as it is the center of European reaction. Both in the West and in the East French official policy keeps Europe in a state of turmoil. By its policy since the armistice, official France has sown in Germany seeds of hatred, from which a future French generation will reap, if the present French policy be allowed to continue, a terrible crop. Every independent observer that was in Germany just after the armistice agrees that there was then no popular hatred of France. Public feeling, as was natural, was directed against England as the author of the blockade. Now, the positions are reversed. England is very popular in Germany, partly on account of the difference between the conduct of the British and French military authorities in the occupied territory. The difference is, as a highly placed German said to me some six months ago, that the British authorities do all they can to cause as little annoyance as possible to the inhabitants, whereas the French do all they can to cause as much as possible. And this is not all. The French authorities promote artificial separatist movements in the Rhine provinces, subsidize the Bavarian monarchists, and pursue in the Saar Valley a policy of veiled annexation with the acquiescence of the Council of the League of Nations. On the top of all this, official France extracts from Germany an indemnity that is ruining the country and makes an international loan to Germany impossible. The British Government, it is true, is just as much responsible for the Treaty of Versailles as the French, but that is getting to be forgotten in Germany, thanks in great measure to the stupidity of French diplomacy and to the success of Mr. Lloyd George in posing as the innocent victim of M. Clemenceau.

In Central and Eastern Europe French diplomacy encourages all the militarist and reactionary forces. With the aim of using Poland as a catspaw, it forces the Poles to maintain a huge army—there is reason to believe that the French Government pays Poland so much a head for every soldier under arms. In any case, there is a military treaty between France and Poland which, in defiance of the covenant of the League of Nations, has never been registered. There is also a secret French understanding with Czechoslovakia, if not with the Little Entente as a whole—an understanding that also obliges the maintenance of immense armies in proportion to the population. French diplomacy supports Horthy and his reactionary regime in Hungary—that is, or was until recently, also true of British diplomacy—and favors the designs of the Bavarian monarchists on Austrian territory. The policy of the Quai d'Orsay is the union of Hungary, Austria, and Bavaria, or at any rate the two latter countries, in a single monarchy. *So far as official France is concerned, popular instinct in England and Italy is therefore right.*

Anti-English feeling in France has, I think, three principal causes: The belief that England has got more than France out of the war; the suspicion that we wish to revise the peace treaties solely at the expense of France, without making any sacrifices ourselves; and the personality of Mr. Lloyd George. None of these is without justification. It is true that we have attained the chief object for which we went to war—the destruction of the German fleet and mercantile marine. It is also true that, in spite of Mr. Lloyd George's solemn declaration that, "as the Lord liveth," we did not desire an inch of German colonial territory, it is we who have taken it practically all. It is equally true that we are attempting to monopolize the oil supplies of the world; that we have laid hands on Constantinople, where we have established something not far removed from a reign of terror; that we have staked out various other claims; and that we have kept up war in the East by our scandalous support of Greek ambitions. *Indeed, since England has supplied the Greeks with war material and France has supplied the Turks, England and France have in fact been making war on each other by proxy.* Moreover, although it is right and necessary to combat French militarism and to demand juster terms for Germany, too little has been said in England about British imperialism, and in speeches about the revision of the peace treaties stress is too exclusively laid on those provisions of the treaties in which France is particularly interested.

Perhaps the personality of Mr. Lloyd George is the most important cause of French anglophobia. His shifty policy—if a succession of moods can be called a policy—has excited intense animosity in France. Even Frenchmen most opposed to the policy of their Government say that a British Prime Minister openly, frankly, and consistently opposing French policy would have excited less animosity. They say, too, that they never know where they are with Mr. Lloyd George, and that, after stirring up the greatest possible amount of irritation, he usually ends by giving way. That was the complaint of many of the "neutrals" at Genoa. A Scandinavian delegate, for example, said that, much as he disliked French policy, he began to understand why the French disliked Mr. Lloyd George. In my opinion, any proposal that Mr. Lloyd George might make would be received with suspicion in France,

and friendship between the two peoples will not be possible so long as he is in power.

The conclusion is that a change of Government in both countries is a necessary condition of restoring really friendly relations between the two peoples. In France no real change is possible for the next two years, except in the unlikely event of a dissolution of the Chamber, for the next general election is not due until May, 1924. In England a change may come sooner. If it meant the return to power of Mr. Asquith and Lord Grey it would not be a change for the better. For a "close understanding" with the Bloc National, *i. e.*, with the political majority now ruling in France—which is Lord Grey's policy—is impossible unless we are prepared to further its policy. When Mr. Asquith and Lord Grey speak of a close understanding with official France as it is—and it is only with official France that a Government can deal—they ignore realities. Moreover, we have surely had enough of "close understandings" with, and "moral obligations" to, any particular country. They have dragged us into one war. We want a close understanding with every country in Europe, but not with one more than another.

On the other hand, I do not understand what is meant by "breaking the Entente." We are bound to France by no treaty other than the peace treaties, which impose upon us certain relations. It would be a mistake to repudiate those relations even if we could, for it would mean handing over Germany to the tender mercies of the Bloc National. In the interest of Germany we must remain in a position to use pressure on the French Government. But, apart from the relations imposed by the peace treaties, we should for the present go our own way and allow official France to go hers. M. Poincaré has claimed for the French Government, with reason, the right to have a different policy from that of the British Government. We must claim and exercise the right to have a policy of our own. There is no sort of reason, for instance, why we should consult the French Government in regard to our Russian policy. The attempt to act with official France in that matter can lead only to dissension. We should agree to differ.

For the rest, we should put our cards on the table and appeal to the French people over the heads of its Government by a public offer. We should offer to cancel the inter-Allied war debts, to renounce our share of the German indemnity, to restore to Germany such of her colonies as we can restore, to abandon Mesopotamia, to restore Constantinople to the Turks with guarantees for the neutrality of the Dardanelles, and to agree to make oil and other raw materials available to the whole world. In return, we can ask from France the evacuation of German territory, the suppression of all the Allied commissions in Germany, the reduction of the indemnity to the cost of restoring the devastated regions, the restoration of the Saar Valley to Germany without depriving France of the coal, and the abandonment of Syria.

Such an offer would put us in a strong position, and, in my opinion, it would be difficult for even the present majority of the French Chamber to stand out against its acceptance for long. The debt owed to us by the French Government gives us an effective means of bringing pressure which we should use without hesitation, for we should be serving the real interests of France in so doing. We must not cancel the debt merely in return for a reduction of the German indemnity—not even to make an international loan to Germany possible. It is essential that the occupation of German territory should cease, not only because it involves huge expenditure, but also because it makes reconciliation between France and Germany impossible.

Reconciliation between France and Germany is essential to real peace in Europe. France will find permanent security only in European unity and general disarmament. Any alliance between England and France, or any "Pact of Guarantee" such as Mr. Lloyd George unwisely offered, would delay European unity and encourage the French militarists in their dream of a French hegemony over the Continent. There are too many disquieting resemblances between the present conditions of France and those of Spain on the eve of her fall, when she, too, was still the strongest military Power in Europe. An attempt of France to retain that position can end only in her destruction. The only path of safety for France is in a complete change of policy, and, unless the change comes soon, it may be too late to avert decay. I am not sure that, in any case, France can really recover from the war, or ever be again what she once was. I am quite sure that the only chance of recovery is the immediate abandonment of all military ambitions and dreams of domination.

Unless and until our offer is accepted and official France is willing to become a "good European," the only possible policy is to take the lead in uniting the other nations of Europe without, and even in a sense against, France. I have never believed that the Genoa Conference would have failed if France had declined to attend it, or had left it after it began. On the contrary, its failure was due to the attempt to secure French co-operation. Much could be done without France. There are possibilities of economic action by the other countries that would do much to improve economic conditions and stabilize the foreign exchanges. The extent to which the idea of free trade is spreading on the Continent is not sufficiently realized in England. If England now took the initiative in forming a Free Trade Union of countries undertaking to impose no protectionist tariffs against the produce of other members of the union, as Mr. Maynard Keynes proposed, I believe that it would meet with a considerable response. One of Mr. Lloyd George's great mistakes at Genoa—and he made many—was his neglect of the smaller nations and his attempt to settle everything between England, France, and Italy. What Europe wants is a lead. England can give that lead only when we have a Prime Minister with a definite and consistent policy.

Although the history of the League of Nations since Mr. Keynes published "The Economic Consequences of the Peace" has fully justified his doubts about the efficacy of the League and his fears about its dangers, it is desirable that Germany and Russia should be induced to join the League, since there is nothing else at present. They are unlikely to do that—and they would be very foolish to do it—unless they are assured in advance of permanent representation on the council. That assurance cannot be given unless France consents. Steps should be taken to obtain an undertaking from every Government represented on the council that will

enable the assurance to be given, and the names of the Governments, if any, that refuse should be made public.

The danger of separate action by France against Germany cannot be lost sight of. There is a strong party in France determined on such action, and much more anxious to trample on Germany than to obtain reparations. The question of the interpretation of the Treaty of Versailles in this regard should at once be submitted to the permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague. If that court, as is probable, decides that separate action on the part of one of the allied Governments is not permitted by the treaty, any such action on the part of France would come within the scope of the covenant of the League of Nations, and the League would be bound to act.

Robert Dell.

An Appeal

A great many of the spiritual workers of all countries are suffering deeply. Their strength is consumed by the rapidly increasing living expense, by the more and more difficult struggle for life, the sad undervalue of spiritual production, sorrow, hunger, misery and illness. Numberless values are ruined every day, such values as the world is needing badly. The cry for bread is great, but greater still is the cry for the bread of life and the hunger of the whole world to be delivered by vivid and true spirit. Come and help those who give to the world this bread of life, who build the ways of spirit, who struggle for the problems which torment us all. Many of them are missing even the most necessary daily food, they have no help, no recovery, no encouragement. Help without any consideration of origin, age, sex, political or religious ideas. Distress is knocking at thousands of doors of the cultivated middle rank, of intellectual workers of all kinds. Help before it is too late.

Signed

America: Jane Addams, Florence Holbrook, Upton Sinclair.

Austria: Rosa Mayreder, Stefan Zweig, Maria Winternitz-Zweig.

Belgium: Paul Colin, Frans Masereel.

France: Lèon Balzagette, Jean-Richard Bloch, Edouard Dujardin, P. J. Jouve, Andree Jouve, Lucien Le Foyer, Marcel Martinet, Charles Richet, Romain Rolland, René Schickelé, Noémi Stricker.

England: Douglas Goldring, Ethel Snowden.

Germany: Graf Arco, Eduard Bernstein, Dr. Joseph Bloch, Prof. Czerny, Prof. Fr. W. Förster, Maximilian Harden, Arthur Holitscher, Dr. Kurt Hiller, Bernhard Kellermann, Graf Kessler, Käthe Kollwitz, Annette Kolb, Mechthild Lichnowski, Prof. Max Liebermann, Prof. Arthur Nikisch, Prof. Nikolai, Adele Schreiber, Prof. Schücking, Dr. Helene Stöcker, Armin T. Wegner u. a.

Hungary: Rosika Schwimmer.

British India: Rabindranath Tagore.

Italy: Federazione Italiana pro Lanreate et Diplomate di Istituti Superiori, Maria Grassi Koenen, Dr. Isabella Grassi, Bice Crova, Prof. Nella Ponzetti, Prof. Maria Loschi, Prof. Maria Castellani, Dr. Nella Mortara, Dr. Antonietta Mantien, Dr. Anna Tonganelli.

Netherlands: Dr. Frederick van Eeden, Dr. Aletta H. Jacobs and her group, Henry Van de Velde.

Russia: Maxim Gorki, Prof. Kanduisky.

Sweden: Selma Lagerlöf.

Switzerland: Emily Balch, Pfarrer Adolf Keller, Dr. Eduard Korrodi, Prof. Ragaz, Baron C. A. E. von Vietinghoff, Jeanne von Vietinghoff.

International Help for Intellectual Workers of the World

Considering the daily increasing expense of living it appears to be an imperious duty to organize help for the spiritual workers who are overwhelmed by misery. The distress of these intellectual proletarians, comprehending all those who exercise liberal professions—writers, artists, learned men, educators, physicians, and others without fixed appointments sufficient for life, has reached its summit. Numberless values are ruined every day in an epoch, which, though materialized and mechanized, and just because of that, has an immense hunger for the bread of life, of spirit. Humanity as a whole has a deep longing for knowledge, transfiguration of visible things, for metaphysical truths. To allow its spiritual workers to perish, is the deathblow of humanity.

The struggle for daily bread, sorrow, illness and hunger ruin the strength of all intellectual workers. It is necessary to help the young ones to grow, still more necessary to help the older ones, the ripe ones, to gather the fruit of their ripeness, those who, too often, alas, are pining away from contact with the misery of life instead of being the ones to give strength, faith, and the harmony of victorious and transfigured life.

Society has failed in a large measure against handworkers—it has failed almost entirely towards brainworkers. Each human being ought to be able to live in a manner worthy of the work of his hands or his brain. At our epoch of transition, of fermentation, we are very far from realizing that aim. A great many men possessing faith, will and courage are lacking work. It is only by concentration of work, of all work, of handwork and brainwork that we shall be able to form a harmonious and blessed society. And because it is so, we ask help. The clamor of an immense distress rises to heaven, the cry of our spiritual workers, and the cry of the spiritual distress of us all.

The work of help ought to comprise two points. First it ought to help in cases of immediate necessity, secondly to assist workers who are tired and ill, to recover their strength. It will be possible perhaps to realize later the idea of an international house of rest in Switzerland or at the Riviera, where workers could not only recover in calm and quiet, but where

they could learn to know each other better than it is possible in the tumult of daily life or congresses.

The work of help ought first be given to the countries which have suffered most during the war.

The help is to be granted without any regard to origin, rank, sex, age, political, religious and other views. Necessity and want alone will have to decide.

We propose the following plan:

1. Formation of an international committee; one or two delegates from each country.

2. Formation of national committees. Each national committee to work for the idea as it seems best. It will try to find opportunities of work for spiritual workers (lectures, concerts, expositions, help for publication).

50% of the gathered money and gifts to be given to the international committee.

3. The international committee to settle the distribution of this money. Countries most tried by war are to be helped first.

4. Seat of the international committee; dwelling-place of its treasurer (Probably Holland, Switzerland or Italy).

5. Effort must be made to form a great international union of all spiritual workers.

CORRESPONDENCE

Progress

Silver Spring, Maryland, 6 August, 1922.

My dear Sir:

In your issue for 1 June I find the following statement: "We can handle them as well as Lucretius or Augustine, as Plato or Kant, as Paul or John Stuart Mill. *We can hardly do worse than the earlier generations and we may do better.*—JESSE H. HOLMES." So say the modern women—"We can hardly do worse than the men, let us take control of government." So, also, might the negroes say—"We can hardly do worse than the whites have done, turn over the reins of government to us." So, also, might our children say (indeed, many of them are saying it at present)—"We can hardly do worse than our parents have done, let us have a trial."

The danger is that all of these self-nominated governors of mundane affairs *will* probably do worse—far worse—than have done those whom they so flippantly propose to supersede. Faulty as has been such government in the past, degraded as it has been by superstition, selfishness, corruption, ignorance, it has yet been the best, all things considered, that the world has been capable of supporting at the time. And it has been marked by progress—forward, not backward,—as may easily be noted when one goes back over the past and takes mental snapshots at intervals of two or three centuries in his retrospect.

Why has the progress been forward? If the world is entirely dependent on the capacity and right thinking of its human population there is as much chance of its retrograding as of its moving forward. The answer to this question is that there is a principle implanted in all life that compels upward movement. This principle (you may regard it as divine or as a law of a mechanical evolution) operates on men individually and in the mass, improving the type and as well the social organization. It works slowly—by evolution, not revolution—and when man, in his self-conceit and self-importance, seeks to hasten it by violent means he makes a mess of his job—witness the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution, *et hoc genus omne.*

Through the working of this principle of forward progress, in the long run the best agents come to the surface and control events. Not necessarily the highest individual types, but those best qualified to hold the current forces in the right path.

When inclined, therefore, to criticize the movements of the army let us be patient and moderate. Perhaps the strategic operations that seem to us so superior to those employed may not be feasible; it is possible that the generals in command are not such fools as we believe them to be. Perhaps, also, we should not make such able generals as we think we should.

Faithfully, yours,

HENRY OLDYS.

Patriotism and Peace

To the Editor of UNITY:

Webster's Dictionary defines patriotism as "love of one's country" and a patriot as "one who loves and is devoted to his native country and its welfare." Are these definitions in accordance with the popular acceptation of the meaning of the words designated? A patriot, to most persons, has the limited significance of a man who is ready, or even eager, to join the army or navy in time of war and, if necessary, sacrifice his life (or become a more or less helpless cripple), in the service of his country. The idea that one could do as efficient work and serve his country as well by living and working for it as by dying or becoming a helpless public charge would appear to be recognized by only an insignificant minority. Why are these words not more often used in reference to other activities than war? What is to blame for the restricted meaning in such general acceptance?

The best patriot is one who strives to promote his country's interests and save it from disaster; and what disaster is greater than war or has more far-reaching and sorrowful consequences physically, mentally and morally to individuals and economically to the nation as a whole? Is it not time that the general public was awakened to the understanding that the highest patriotism consists in endeavoring to promote the best interests of one's native land or chosen abode and that this can best be done by preventing the curse of war from blighting it?

General John F. O'Ryan goes so far as to say, "I would be a traitor to my country if I did not do all in my power to abolish war." Has not the time come now, today, for the public to be told and taught that the generally accepted idea of patriotism must give way to a different one, the right one, a far higher and more inspiring ideal, one that will lead away from the horrors and destruction of warfare, and its subsequent distress and anguish to peace and prosperity for every one?

To prevent the curse of war from fastening itself again on the country we love we must exert ourselves to work against it till it is banished from the earth. All are needed in this great work. Youth and age alike can share in it and help to hasten the day when peace and goodwill shall reign. For that time is sure and inevitable and whether the force that will bring it be a moral or an economic one the world is headed for universal peace. In spite of its long sad war history, the change is coming, the end of warfare is at hand and the era of peace is ahead. In the natural process of events peace is bound to come—as were public schools and equal suffrage. It may be retarded by ignorance and stupidity—it cannot be prevented. Let us then, each and everyone, prove ourselves to be patriots of the highest order by doing what we can in the joyful task of establishing peace upon the earth. Let us help to hasten the day of its coming.

LYDIA G. WENTWORTH.

IN A PLEASAUNCE.

A circle of magic, girt with bloom,
Is weaving its spell on a single soul,
Beyond it the meadow and yonder the sea—
The patient meadow, the wistful sea.
Above it a radiant, palpitant sky,
A visitant sky, bringing far things nigh.

Every quivering petal, thrilled with light,
Is throb of a mystical, cosmic Whole.

An earth full of balm
In heaven is shrined.

Enthralled in its rapture of fathomless calm
The soul remembers an ancient psalm:—
"Out of Beauty's perfection GOD
hath shined."

KATHARINE HANSON AUSTIN.

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

RUSSIAN CHILDREN.

The American Committee for Relief of Russian Children, a non-political and non-sectarian organization, has recently extended its field to include the middle west, and is asking the co-operation of all men and women who value human life, in its work of sending milk—and more milk—into Russia *this summer.* A letter has been addressed to ministers by Bishop Francis J. McConnell of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Dean Paul Nixon, of Bowdoin College, and Rev. John Haynes Holmes, saying:

"Will you not put on your church calendar a date for this appeal, now before it becomes too full? And will you not send in that date to the office of the American Committee, so that they may plan the sending of literature for this appeal? It is especially desirous that this date be as early as possible so that the food may reach the children before winter sets in. If it can be made effectively now, during the summer, so much the better. But before it is too late, let us give this evidence of the spirit that is in us."

All reports from the famine areas, including Mr. Hoover's, agree that suffering and undernourishment, for small children in particular, will be acute for a long time. Even a successful grain harvest will be of little immediate benefit to the babies—and the number of cows, as of all live-stock, has been seriously reduced. The American Committee for Relief of Russian Children has inaugurated a MILLION CANS OF MILK campaign. If you have faith in the world's future, and in the children of today, who are to mold that future, will you not contribute either money or personal service in connection with this campaign?

Among the members of the Organizing Committee for Illinois are Charles Clayton Morrison, Mrs. Raymond Robins, Ralph E. Diffendorfer, Mrs. Harold L. Ickes, Frances C. Lillie, Dr. Caroline Hedger, Robert Morss Lovett, Olive Cole Smith, Frances M. Ford, Florence Holbrook, and others. Edward C. Wentworth is treasurer. Checks should be made payable to the Committee, and sent to Ruth R. Pearson, Secretary for Illinois, 5706 Stony Island Ave., Chicago. Cases of condensed milk, clothing, medical supplies, etc., may be shipped direct to the national office, 110 W. 40th St., New York City.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE.

A correspondent in Manila writes:

"Like the busy little bee I improved a few shining hours in endeavoring to ascertain the thought of all sorts of people regarding Philippine independence. I talked to natives on the tram cars, to civilians, soldiers, a newspaper man and others. The situation seems to be about as it was a few years ago. When I asked an intelligent English-speaking Filipino he would very likely tell me that 'all' want independence. A native business man somewhat dependent on the expenditures of the United States army will declare that the American occupation is a good thing. Army officers with whom I conversed honestly believed that the Filipinos could not govern themselves if given the opportunity to do so. An American private seemed to feel that the country cost the people of the United States more than it gave them and that the few Americans who made money out of our holding the country were already rich enough. White civilians have declared to me that native politicians stir up a demand for release from American control hoping thereby to enhance their own emoluments and power. So it goes. My own conviction is that the good old Declaration of Independence of 1776 and its reference to 'the consent of the governed' may be forgotten in this conflict of opinions and that our retaining the islands as an impregnable fortress is considered by certain Powers as a menace to them which some day they may seek to remove. If such is the case we may well apprehend that holding the Philippines is subtly endangering our own ideals as to human liberty and may become a source of weakness and danger, not of strength and security, to America."

WILLIAM C. ALLEN.

THE TRAGIC PASSING OF THE ENGLISH COUNTRY MANSION.

The Marquis of Linlithgow has had to decide that he can no longer afford to keep up the almost regal house of his family at Hopetoun. His share of the cost of munitions, called for by his country in the form of income and super tax, was so great that not enough income is left to maintain the estate and its farms.

Presumably, therefore, Hopetoun House will go the way of other classical palaces and be sold. Then it may house for a while some profiteer so titanic that he can afford to clothe the nakedness of the estate out of the spare trimmings of his other investments. Or else it may abandon the career for which it was made, as a vast essay in domestic architecture, and start life anew as a school or museum or orphanage.

It is rather a thin clarity of mind that can find no other interest in a casualty of this kind beyond the natural extinction of a social unit that has outlived its own aptness to its environment.

Easy enough to see that the great country estate, as a going concern and not as a hobby kept up with the proceeds of mineral royalties or urban ground rents, could not in any case have lived on much further in the modern world. The war, no doubt, has only been like an unseasonable frost which kills in September the geraniums that would have had to die anyhow in November.

Few of us can feel the sureness that many of our forefathers felt about the rightness of perpetual and unqualified family ownership of great wealth; in all of us there has been shaken, if not shat-

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Look at the world from a new angle and take account of thought and sentiment not found in the general press.

UNITY

Is a paper dedicated to:
An unfettered religion of service to Humanity, a recognition and acceptance of democracy, in its widest and deepest implications both individual and social. It seeks to serve men and women who will and dare, whether in groups and together, or in the freedom of individual effort, to do whatever the urging inward spirit of fellowship bids.

EDITORS: John Haynes Holmes, Francis Neilson

EDITORIAL BOARD:

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
HENRY R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

FOREIGN REPRESENTATIVES:

Australia, Charles Strong; Austria, Stefan Zweig; Bulgaria, P. M. Matthéeff; Canada, Sidney Snow; England, Fred Hankinson, E. D. Morel, Walter Walsh; France, G. Demartial, Romain Rolland; India, Rabindranath Tagore; Russia, Alina Huebsch.

Published at 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies, 10 cents.
Sample copies on application

tered, the old easy assumption that the average great landowner, with his pleasant consciousness of beneficent stewardship, his picturesque addiction to sport, his gratifying and not exhausting labors of local government, and his somewhat severely limited intellect, was really a kind of rural radium from which indispensable economic and moral benefits radiated in all directions.

The Augustan age of the country-house will have left behind it memorable deposits. All our arts have labored for it, as the arts of Italy and France labored for the Medici and for the Grand Monarch. It set to work Vanbrugh and Adam and Gibbons to plan and adorn its most massive monuments to itself; its amplitude made such galleries for painters from Vandyke to Millais as no mere town houses could have afforded; half a dozen great recent auctions have amazed the connoisseurs of such things with a new sense of the magnificent wealth of the English art of furniture design.

Of course, there are great country houses full of sad rubbish; of course, too, the modern possessor of one of the occasional museums of pure treasure is sometimes quite piquantly insensible to its beauty; and yet this little universe of fine things has accumulated pretty steadily.

And all the time the special English art of prose fiction has had its eyes fastened almost fanatically on this peculiarly English social product. Fielding chuckled over it in its uncouth youth; Jane Austen steeped it in the quiet sunshine of an affectionate irony; Thackeray and George Eliot, while seeing with very dissimilar eyes its germs of decay, delighted in spite of themselves in the mellow old-masterliness of its scenes and its properties. As the dissipations of eighteenth-century London live in the prints of Hogarth, so the noontide lustre of the English country-house will survive in the Victorian novelists, and Mr. Galsworthy has left for the future a set of most delicate and veracious pictures of it in the first consciousness of its oncoming decline.

Of course there are other sides to this perishing institution besides this æsthetic one. There were a great many sides to the Versailles of Louis XIV and all that it meant. But, whether it served the nation well or ill in its generation, the period of country-house domination in England had certainly, like the old order in France, something of the æsthetic interest of a "collector's piece."

—*Manchester Guardian.*

Subscribe for and read

UNITY

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

Are you interested in

The abolition of War
The release of *all* Political Prisoners
The relief work in Russia and Poland
The re-adjustment of economic conditions to the end that *all* may have some chance for happiness

These things are discussed in

THE FRIENDS' INTELLIGENCER

Issued Weekly ***Annual subscription, $2.50***

140 N. 15th STREET **PHILADELPHIA, PA.**

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

For Your Baby's Sake—

Use BOWMAN'S MILK. Perfect pasteurization by the Bowman "holding" method makes it safe without impairing its high nutritive value.

Ask our polite salesman to serve you.

BOWMAN DAIRY Company

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

Fancy Gowns and Kid Gloves

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

Phone Drexel 0231
All Departments

MAIN OFFICE AND WORK:
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue